Appeal: 12-6956 Doc: 9 Filed: 10/02/2012 Pg: 1 of 3

## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-6956

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JAMES PAUL ANDREW STILLWELL,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Abingdon. James P. Jones, District Judge. (1:04-cr-00010-JPJ-1; 1:12-cv-80430-JPJ)

Submitted: September 27, 2012 Decided: October 2, 2012

Before MOTZ, DAVIS, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

James Paul Andrew Stillwell, Appellant Pro Se. Zachary T. Lee, Assistant United States Attorney, Abingdon, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

James Paul Andrew Stillwell seeks to appeal the district court's order denying as successive his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2012) motion. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B) (2006). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2006). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the motion states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. Slack, 529 U.S. at 484-85.

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Stillwell has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis, and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately Appeal: 12-6956 Doc: 9 Filed: 10/02/2012 Pg: 3 of 3

presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED